

Regional Business License and Permits Program  
Phasing Options  
Tuesday, January 12, 2015

The project plan with the revised go-live date of August 22, 2016 assumes that all four agencies go-live on that date. At the request of the Oversight Group, the project team and Accela have reviewed different options for go-live by individual agency or by module.

The options below assume that Accela Citizen Access (ACA) would not be implemented until all agencies are in production with the exception of the existing ACA for Reno.

### **Implementation by Agency**

#### *Option 1 - Two separate go-lives - Accela Automation (AA)*

1. City of Reno – AA and existing ACA for Reno
2. City of Sparks – AA
3. Washoe County and Health District – AA on August 22, 2016
4. ACA Go live is August 22, 2016 for all jurisdictions

#### Costs – Option 1

- Second Data Conversion - \$12,000
- Second Go-Live Support - \$17,328 + travel
  - Total Anticipated costs prior travel: **\$29,328**

#### *Option 2 - Three separate go-lives for Business License and Permit*

1. City of Reno - AA and existing ACA for Reno
2. City of Sparks – AA
3. Washoe County and Health District – AA
4. ACA Go live for all jurisdictions

#### Costs – Option 2

- Second and Third Data Conversions - \$24,000
- Second and Third Go-Live Support - \$34,656 + travel
  - Total Anticipated costs prior travel: **\$58,656**

Services included in each go-live are:

- One stand-alone final conversion
- Onsite Production Support (Go Live):
  - Accela Lead Tech: 3 days (24 hours total / 8 hours a day)
  - Accela Consultant: 3 days (24 hours total / 8 hours a day)
- Post Go Live Support (Post Go Live):
  - Accela Lead Tech: 3 weeks (24 hours /estimated total over the 3 weeks)
  - Accela Consultant: 3 weeks (24 hours/estimated total over the 3 weeks)

The following are the pros and cons to either Option 1 or Option 2:

#### Pros

- Would allow Reno and Sparks to implement prior to Washoe, together or separately based on option selected

Regional Business License and Permits Program  
Phasing Options  
Tuesday, January 12, 2015

Cons

- Agencies would need to create interim processes for:
  - Handling multi-jurisdictional licenses through to payment
  - Requiring duplication of work in multiple systems
- Evaluation of regional setup, back out and reconfigure as needed (including delegate user setup etc.)
- User Acceptance Testing will be extended further to test each implementation with the current production instance (extensive regression testing required)
- Significant effort will be required on the part of the agencies to document the requirements for separate implementations.
- Each business function within the system must be investigated to identify agency interactions that will be impacted. For each interaction, plans must include tasks to decouple the interactions and then recouple as agencies are added to the production system. This includes scripting, reporting, user and administrative access, workflows, interfaces and all other components of the implementation.
- Accela cannot guarantee the 8/22/16 go-live for the remainder of the project if the phasing options are chosen, without additional mitigation of risks and potential additional resources.

The Superagency Coordination Committee will need to ensure that the phased approach is incorporated into the regional plans for testing, training and implementation.

**Implementation by Module**

Further information would be required to fully cost this option; however, the following should be taken into consideration. Many of these items listed below were identified in a previous exercise to determine if a phased approach would work by module.

- All modules would need to be reviewed for interactions, and those interactions would need to be evaluated for impact to functionality and processes.
- Existing ACA for Reno versus the regional ACA
- There will be risk with performing additional conversions for the remaining data to move into an already production/live environment
- Probable dual data entry into two systems
- Switching between systems is time consuming and error prone
- Inaccurate reporting as all required data may not be available

This is not a recommended option from Accela or TruePoint. Vendor solution architects believe the risk to a successful implementation outweigh the benefit.